



STATE OF WASHINGTON

HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD

917 Lakeridge Way • PO Box 43430 • Olympia, Washington 98504-3430 • (360) 753-7800 • TDD (360) 753-7809

PRELIMINARY BOARD MEETING AGENDA

*Western Washington University, Old Main 340
516 High Street, Bellingham, Washington 98225
July 31, 2002*

*Approximate
Times*

Tab

8:30 a.m. Continental Breakfast & Overview of Meeting Agenda (Solarium, Old Main)
No official business will be conducted at this time.

9:30 a.m. Welcome and introductions

- Bob Craves, HECB Chair
- President Karen Morse, Western Washington University

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

Adoption of June 2002 HECB Meeting Minutes **1**

New Degree Programs for Approval

- WSU, BS in Bioengineering **2**
(Resolution 02-19)
- WSU, BS in Environmental and Resource Economics and Management **3**
(Resolution 02-20)
- WSU, BS and MS in Biotechnology **4**
(Resolution 02-21)
- UW, PhD in Technical Communication **5**
(Resolution 02-22)

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- **Status Report: Notification of Intent** (new public baccalaureate degree programs) **6**

10:00 a.m. HECB Preliminary 2003-05 Budget Request **7**

- HECB staff briefing
- HECB executive committee report and recommendations
(Resolution 02-23)

10:15 a.m. Break

- 10:30 a.m. 2004 Master Plan Update** **8**
- HECB staff briefing
 - Public comment and discussion with the Board
- 12:00 noon** Lunch (Solarium, Old Main)
No official business will be conducted at this time.
- 1:00 p.m. EWU Gender Equity Plan** **9**
- Scott Barnes, EWU athletic director
(Resolution 02-24)
- 1:20 p.m. Educational Opportunity Grant (EOG)** **10**
HECB staff briefing
- 1:45 p.m. WWU Report: “Pathways to Careers in Education”** **11**
- Dr. Chuck Atkinson, Assoc. Dean of Woodring College of Education
 - Dr. George “Pinky” Nelson, Director of Science, Math & Technology Education Center
 - Sally Holloway, Whatcom Community College Education Program Coordinator
 - Jill Iwasaki, Ferndale High School Teaching Academy teacher

PUBLIC COMMENT

2:30 p.m. ADJOURNMENT

July 30, 4:30 – 7:30 p.m. *Tour of Western Washington University campus and dinner with WWU trustees, president, and staff. No official business will be conducted.*

HECB 2002 Meeting Calendar

DATE	TIME	LOCATION
Sept. 25, Wed. 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Regular meeting	Capitol Campus John A. Cherberg Bldg, SHR4
Oct 29, Tue. 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Regular meeting	Olympia
Dec. 12, Thu. 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Regular meeting	University of Washington, Seattle Walker Ames Room, Kane Hall

If you are a person with disability and require an accommodation for attendance, or need this agenda in an alternative format, please call the HECB at (360) 753-7800 as soon as possible to allow us sufficient time to make arrangements. We also can be reached through our Telecommunication Device for the Deaf at (360) 753-7809.

Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board

MINUTES OF MEETING
June 11, 2002

July 2002

HECB Members Present

Mr. Bob Craves, chair
Dr. Gay Selby, vice chair
Ms. Pat Stanford, secretary
Mr. Jim Faulstich
Ms. Roberta Greene
Ms. Ann Ramsay-Jenkins
Mr. Herb Simon

Welcome and introductions

HECB Chairman Bob Craves called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. Dr. Priscilla Bell, president of Highline Community College (HCC), gave a few words of welcome. Highline is celebrating its 40th anniversary this year, serving up to 10,000 students in 34 buildings, including a higher education center being built in collaboration with Washington State University. In line with HCC's new mission and vision is a renewed focus on international education. The school has ongoing efforts in South Africa and Libya, helping institutions there to develop entrepreneurial and technology programs. At the college, comprehensive global programs infuse internationalism in course work.

Consent agenda item approved

ACTION: *Jim Faulstich moved for consideration of the consent agenda items, with a second from Pat Stanford:*

- *Minutes of the Board's March 27 meeting*
- **Resolution 02-09** *approving the Fund for Innovation grant report, and*
- *approval of six new degree programs:*

Resolution 02-10, *M.S. in Genetic Epidemiology, UW*

Resolution 02-11, *Ph.D. in Public Health Genetics, UW*

Resolution 02-12, *LL.M. in Intellectual Property Law and Policy, UW*

Resolution 02-13, *M.S. in Computing and Software Systems, UWT*

Resolution 02-14, *Ph.D. in Communication, WSU*

Resolution 02-15, *Doctor of Physical Therapy, EWU*

All items were unanimously approved after comments from EWU staff.

Board approves doctorate degree in physical therapy at EWU

Department Chair Dr. Donna El-Din thanked the Board for approving Eastern Washington University's proposal to offer a doctorate degree in physical therapy. This action puts EWU in the mainstream of professional physical therapy and allows the university to respond to the complex health needs of the community. Of a projected 40 student enrollments in five years, Dr. El-Din reported that 36 students already have been admitted to next year's class.

Dean and Vice Provost Ron Dalla, Dean Ray Soltero, and faculty members Nancy Erikson, Walt Erikson, and Byron Russell also were on hand to show support for the program. This is the first doctorate program that will be offered at a traditionally undergraduate (regional) institution in the state. The program will be housed at the Riverpoint Higher Education Park in Spokane.

Director's report

HECB Executive Director Marc Gaspard outlined the agenda for the day. He announced that the public forum in the afternoon would feature Pat Callan, president of the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. Mr. Callan is expected to share some of the major findings from the Center's recent report, "Losing Ground." The report examines trends in state support for public colleges and universities, tuition trends and practices, and the extent of financial aid for students. Legislators and institutional representatives are expected to participate in the forum.

Mr. Gaspard then provided updates on HECB programs and activities:

- Substantial enrollment increases in the Guaranteed Education Tuition program (GET);
- New State Need Grant amounts – increase will cover only 70 percent of tuition;
- Recent WICHE meeting – significant attention being paid to shortages in healthcare professions; many states experiencing economic downturn and facing issues similar to Washington; the state's increase in tuition appears to be higher than most other western states.

Transfer and articulation

Ruta Fanning, HECB deputy director, gave a brief report on the action group's last meeting. The transfer and articulation action group is made up of institutional representatives from the two- and four-year public and private colleges and universities, including the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) and the HECB. Also present at this meeting were representatives from the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board, the Governor's Office, legislative staff, and HECB Vice Chair Gay Selby.

The group concluded that direct transfer agreements (DTAs) to associate degrees, as well as school-to-school transfer agreements, are working well. Applied technical degrees and upside down degrees are being considered for wider application. The issue of transfer and articulation remains complex however, due largely to the diversity of community and technical college students (backgrounds, preparation, pathways, etc.). The action group reviewed and reaffirmed its strategies and next steps.

SBCTC Executive Director Earl Hale talked about strategic perspective and agreements with four-year institutions. Access to universities and access to majors are the major concerns of the two-year system. Some of their strategies to improve transfers include:

- Building closer relationships with branch campuses, such as coordinating programs and courses, planning joint programs, using facilities together, collocating programs and using university centers.
- Designing course-specific transfer degrees.
- Building statewide transfer agreements.

Rules change: Degree-granting Institutions Act

HECB Associate Directors David Sousa and Michael Ball briefed the Board about their review of the rules for implementing the Degree-granting Institutions Act, and their proposed changes, which are designed to:

- 1) Clarify the regulations;
- 2) Address inconsistencies that have hampered day-to-day administration of the law;
- 3) Tighten authorization requirements;
- 4) Improve protections for students in case an authorized institution closes;
- 5) Ensure the HECB meets the statutory requirement that fees approximately recover the staffing costs of degree authorization; and
- 6) Improve communication between the agency and the community about degree authorization requirements and the authorization process.

Staff work on the proposed rules changes is ongoing. Board action was not required at this meeting.

Emergency rules for State Need Grant, State Work Study, and Promise Scholarship

Legislation adopted during the 2002 legislative session necessitates amendments to rules governing these three programs. Becki Collins, HECB director for education services, and Linda Lamar, senior associate director, summarized the changes needed to bring these programs into compliance with the new legislation.

- State Need Grant: SSB 5166 expands the definition of “institutions of higher education” to include branches of out-of-state institutions that meet certain criteria.
- State Work Study: SSB 5166 also amends “eligible institutions” for purposes of this program.
- Promise Scholarship: House Bill 2807 established this program in statute and modified some of the program features.

Adoption of the proposed emergency rules will authorize immediate implementation of statutory changes. The Board will be asked to adopt permanent rules in September.

ACTION: *Pat Stanford* moved for consideration of **Res. 02-16, 17, and 18**, to approve the emergency rules for the State Need Grant program, State Work Study, and the Promise Scholarship. **Roberta Greene** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Development of 2004 Master Plan

The Board has directed staff to provide master plan updates and discussion of issues at each regular Board meeting until adoption of the plan in December 2003. Bruce Botka, HECB director for government relations and policy, summarized the activities, issues, and the goals of the HECB in developing the new master plan. Outreach to higher education constituents has begun, and a core group of HECB staff has been formed to oversee the development process and work with a larger group in developing specific issues.

Some of the key issues identified to date include:

- Funding of higher education
- Tuition and financial aid policies and practices
- Enrollment needs
- Transfer and articulation

Budget recommendations for the 2003-05 will be linked to the priorities that will be addressed in the master plan.

Associate Director Jim Reed talked about the development timeline and schematic of the process, as well as sequencing of information and board actions.

Bob Craves suggested that the preamble include the issues that the master plan would focus on.

The meeting adjourned at noon.

Higher education forum

HECB members and staff joined various representatives from the Legislature and the colleges and universities for the afternoon's discussion with Pat Callan. The forum was co-sponsored by the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, the Senate and House Higher Education Committees, and the HECB. Higher Education Committee Chairs Sen. Jeanne Kohl-Welles and Rep. Phyllis Kenney served as moderators.

A list of participants is attached.

Higher Education Forum featuring Pat Callan, National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education

June 11, 1:30 – 3:30 P.M.

Highline Community College, Building 7, Auditorium

Co-moderators: Sen. Jeanne Kohl-Welles, chair, Senate Higher Education Committee
Rep. Phyllis Kenney, chair, House Higher Education Committee

Forum Participants:

Sen. Don Carlson	Jane Nishita, SBCTC member
Sen. Paull Shin	Earl Hale, SBCTC executive director
Rep. Maralyn Chase	Sandy Wall, SBCTC Dir., Admin. Services
Rep. Pat Lantz	Gay Selby, HECB vice chair
Sen. Pat Thibaudeau	Pat Stanford, HECB secretary
Pres. Steve Jordan, EWU	Jim Faulstich, HECB Fiscal chair
Provost David Soltz, CWU	Roberta Greene, HECB member
Provost Andy Bodman, WWU	Ann Ramsay-Jenkins, HECB member
Dean George Bridges, UW Undergrad Ed.	Marc Gaspard, HECB executive director
Dr. Jane Sherman, WSU assoc. vice provost	Ruta Fanning, HECB deputy director
Pres. Don Bressler, Renton Technical College	
Pres. Steve Wall, Pierce College District	

RESOLUTION NO. 02-09

WHEREAS, The 1999-2001 state operating budget provided \$600,000 in grant funds for the Fund for Innovation and Quality to encourage higher education institutions to develop innovative and collaborative solutions to statewide educational challenges; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board was directed to administer these grants through a competitive process for the public four-year college and universities; and

WHEREAS, The institutions receiving the grants have completed their projects and submitted final reports regarding the activities completed and the lessons learned; and

WHEREAS, A summary of these final reports was presented to the Higher Education Coordinating Board at its meeting on June 11, 2002; and

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board accepts the final reports of the grantee institutions and the summary report presented by HECB staff.

Adopted:

June 11, 2002

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Pat Stanford, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 02-10

WHEREAS, The University of Washington proposes to offer a Master of Science in Genetic Epidemiology, beginning fall 2002; and

WHEREAS, The program will provide advanced studies in genetic epidemiology and address the critical need for highly trained individuals in academia, biotechnology, and public health settings; and

WHEREAS, The external reviews attest to the high quality of the program of study and faculty members; and

WHEREAS, The assessment and diversity plans are exemplary; and

WHEREAS, The program costs are not excessive;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the University of Washington request to establish a Master of Science in Genetic Epidemiology, effective June 11, 2002.

Adopted:

June 11, 2002

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Pat Stanford, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO.02-11

WHEREAS, The University of Washington proposes to establish a Doctor of Philosophy in Public Health Genetics, beginning fall 2002; and

WHEREAS, The program will address the critical need for scientists who can evaluate, communicate, apply, and further advance the broad aspects of genetics as they relate to human health and disease processes; and

WHEREAS, The external reviews attest to the quality of the program and high caliber of faculty; and

WHEREAS, The diversity and assessment efforts will serve students and the program well; and

WHEREAS, The costs are reasonable;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the University of Washington proposal to establish a Doctor of Philosophy in Public Health Genetics, effective June 11, 2002.

Adopted

June 11, 2002

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Pat Stanford, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 02-12

WHEREAS, The University of Washington proposes to establish a Master of Laws in Intellectual Property Law and Policy; and

WHEREAS, The program will provide specialized advanced studies in legal education in the rights and protections associated with intellectual property; and

WHEREAS, There is high demand for professionals with this training; and

WHEREAS, The assessment and diversity plans are well suited for the program; and

WHEREAS, The program will be offered on a self-sustaining basis;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the University of Washington proposal to establish a Master of Laws in Intellectual Property Law and Policy degree, effective July 11, 2002.

Adopted:

June 11, 2002

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Pat Stanford, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 02-13

WHEREAS, The University of Washington Tacoma has requested approval to establish a Master of Science in Computing and Software Systems; and

WHEREAS, UWT's Institute of Technology, which was recently created to address the critical personnel needs of the high-tech industry, will sponsor the program; and

WHEREAS, The resources dedicated to the program will provide students a high-quality teaching and learning; and

WHEREAS, The assessment and diversity plans are suitable for a program of this nature; and

WHEREAS, The program costs are reasonable and will be supported through reallocation, new state funds, and private donations;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the University of Washington Tacoma request to establish a Master of Science in Computing and Software Systems, effective July 11, 2002.

Adopted:

June 11, 2002

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Pat Stanford, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 02-14

WHEREAS, Washington State University has requested approval to establish a Doctor of Philosophy in Communication; and

WHEREAS, The program will prepare individuals with a specialty in intercultural communication to assume faculty positions in communication across the nation; and

WHEREAS, The program reflects the wise reallocation of resources to respond to marketplace needs; and

WHEREAS, The external reviews attest to the quality of the program;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Washington State University request to establish a Doctor of Philosophy in Communication, effective June 11, 2002.

Adopted:

June 11, 2002

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Pat Stanford, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 02-15

WHEREAS, Eastern Washington University has requested to establish a Doctor of Physical Therapy; and

WHEREAS, There appears to be strong need for the doctoral-level physical therapy program in the Northwest; and

WHEREAS, The program is expected to make important contributions to the health care industry and the academy; and

WHEREAS, The external reviews attest to the quality of the instruction; and

WHEREAS, The assessment and diversity plans are exemplary;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Eastern Washington University proposal to establish a Doctor of Physical Therapy degree, effective June 11, 2002.

Adopted

June 11, 2002

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Pat Stanford, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 02-16

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board is directed by RCW 28B.10 to administer the State Need Grant Program; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board is authorized by RCW 28B.80 to adopt rules as necessary to implement the program; and

WHEREAS, Substitute Senate Bill 5166 adopted by the 2002 Legislature expands the definition of "institutions of higher education" to include branches of out-of-state institutions that meet specified criteria and that are members of accrediting associations recognized by rule of the Board; and

WHEREAS, State Need Grant rules do not currently recognize five of the six regional associations that accredit institutions which may potentially be eligible to participate in the State Need Grant program; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to amend Chapter 250-20 WAC to implement this statutory change; and

WHEREAS, It is the Board's intention that students attending institutions incorporated into the State Need Grant program as a result of this change be eligible for grants for the 2002-2003 academic year;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Board adopt emergency rules recognizing all six regional accrediting associations for purposes of establishing potential institutional eligibility to participate in the State Need Grant program.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board directs staff to initiate the process required to adopt permanent rules at the Board's September 2002 meeting.

Adopted:

June 11, 2002

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Pat Stanford, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 02-17

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board is directed by RCW 28B.12 to administer the State Work Study Program; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board is authorized by RCW 28B.80 to adopt rules as necessary to implement the program; and

WHEREAS, Substitute Senate Bill 5166 adopted by the 2002 Legislature expands the definition of "institutions of higher education" to include branches of out-of-state institutions that meet specified criteria and that are members of accrediting associations recognized by rule of the Board; and

WHEREAS, State Work Study rules do not currently recognize five of the six regional associations that accredit institutions which may potentially be eligible to participate in the State Work Study program; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to amend Chapter 250-40 WAC to implement this statutory change; and

WHEREAS, It is the Board's intention that students attending institutions incorporated into the State Work Study program as a result of this change be eligible for work study for the 2002-2003 academic year;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Board adopt emergency rules recognizing all six regional accrediting associations for purposes of establishing potential institutional eligibility to participate in the State Work Study program.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board directs staff to initiate the process required to adopt permanent rules at the Board's September 2002 meeting.

Adopted:

June 11, 2002

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Pat Stanford, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 02-18

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board is directed by House Bill 2807 to administer the Washington Promise Scholarship Program and to adopt rules as necessary to implement the program; and

WHEREAS, Prior to the 2002 Legislative Session, language authorizing the Promise Scholarship program had been included in the 1999-01 and 2001-03 biennial budget bills; and

WHEREAS, House Bill 2807 established the Washington Promise Scholarship program in statute and modified some features of the program; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to amend Chapter 250-80 WAC to bring the Promise Scholarship program into compliance with the new statute by including reference to expanded academic eligibility criteria, use of the scholarship at certain Oregon institutions providing programs not offered in Washington, recognition of all six regional accrediting associations, and the satisfactory progress requirement for scholarship renewal; and

WHEREAS, It is the Board's intention that the expanded eligibility criteria be used to determine awards for the 2002-2003 academic year;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Board adopt emergency rules implementing these changes.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board directs the staff to initiate the process required to adopt permanent rules at the Board's September 2002 meeting.

Adopted:

June 11, 2002

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Pat Stanford, Secretary

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN BIOENGINEERING

Washington State University

July 2002

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Washington State University is proposing to establish a Bachelor of Science in Bioengineering. The program would respond to industry's high demand for professionals in biotechnology and medical technology. Bioengineers understand the analytical tools and methods of engineering, physical sciences, biological, and medical sciences. They create new instruments, materials, processes, and techniques to deal with biologically and medically oriented problems and to improve the human condition.

PROGRAM NEED

The proposal builds a strong case for the new undergraduate program in bioengineering at WSU.

- *“Biotechnology and medical technology comprise one of Washington state’s most rapidly growing economic sectors. As reported in the 2001 Washington Biotechnology and Medical Technology Annual report, biotechnology and medical technology companies and non-profit research organizations in Washington state continue to experience steady employment growth.”*
- *“Biotechnology and medical technology industries require a highly educated population and world-class, cutting-edge research conducted at the research universities and institutions in the state. The twenty-first century will be marked by the convergence of biotechnology and medical technology with informatics, genomics, materials, and engineering,”*
- *“Data from the Whitaker Foundation demonstrate that undergraduate bioengineering enrollment has more than doubled in the past 20 years, while graduate bioengineering enrollment has increased by more than 300% during this period. As such, bioengineering is the fastest-growing engineering discipline in the U.S.”*

The University of Washington has one of the nation's premier programs in bioengineering. It includes five specialized tracks of study. In comparison, the WSU program would offer a broad-based curriculum.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The BS in Bioengineering would require students to complete 128 total credits. Components of the curriculum include: (1) a core biological curriculum, (2) elective courses, (3) a foundation of engineering sciences, (4) capstone experiences, (5) integration of biological sciences and engineering principles. The program would prepare individuals for employment or graduate

studies. It would be supported essentially by existing faculty and staff. At full enrollment the program would accommodate 90 FTE students. It is expected that they would enroll on a full-time basis and earn their degrees in four years. Throughout the program, students would use a variety of technologies to accomplish a variety of assignments, including engineering calculations, simulations, and research.

ASSESSMENT AND DIVERSITY

The proposal for the BS in Bioengineering presents exemplary assessment and diversity plans. The assessment plan is consistent with the standards established by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology. Historically, the participation of women and minorities in engineering programs has been low. WSU would continue to take strategic steps to attract and retain these underrepresented groups.

REVIEW PARTICIPANTS

This proposal was shared with the other public baccalaureate institutions and three external reviewers.

1. Dr. Mark S. Redfern, William Kepler Whiteford, professor, Departments of Bioengineering, Otolaryngology and Rehabilitation Science, University of Pittsburgh
2. Dr. Sanjeev G. Shroff, professor, and Gerald E. McGinnis, chair in Bioengineering, professor of medicine, University of Pittsburgh
3. Dr. Paul N. Hale, Jr., P.E., Cengiz Topakglu Professor of Biomedical Engineering, Associate Dean for External Programs, Louisiana Tech University

All of the reviewers and Central Washington University supported the proposal. The reviewers also posed some concerns that WSU has satisfactorily addressed.

PROGRAM COSTS

The program would be supported through internal reallocation, new state funds, and gifts and grants for equipment purchases. At full enrollment, the annual program costs would be about \$1,452,381, or \$16,138 per FTE student.

STAFF ANALYSIS

WSU's proposed BS in Bioengineering would be popular among students and employers. The broad-based program of study would provide excellent preparation for working in biotechnology and medical technology industries. The assessment and diversity plans are exemplary. In addition, the program costs are reasonable.

RECOMMENDATION

The proposal for a new Bachelor of Science in Bioengineering at Washington State University is recommended for approval, effective July 31, 2002.

RESOLUTION NO. 02-19

WHEREAS, Washington State University is seeking approval to offer a new Bachelor of Science in Bioengineering; and

WHEREAS, Student interest and industry demand for the program is strong; and

WHEREAS, The broad-based program of study will prepare individuals for a variety of careers or graduate studies; and

WHEREAS, The assessment and diversity plans are exemplary; and

WHEREAS, The program costs are reasonable;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Washington State University request to establish a Bachelor of Science in Bioengineering, effective July 31, 2002.

Adopted:

July 31, 2002

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Pat Stanford, Secretary

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN ENVIRONMENTAL AND RESOURCE ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT

Washington State University

July 2002

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Washington State University proposes to establish a Bachelor of Science in Environmental and Resource Economics and Management (EREM). The program would respond to environmental issues and economic growth, provide a program very different from traditional environmental sciences, economics, and management programs, and build on the strengths of existing WSU faculty and programs.

PROGRAM NEED

The EREM program proposal supports WSU's mission to offer technical, science, and engineering programs devoted to environmental and resource issues. The proposal presents convincing evidence that there is strong need for the program. Economic growth places great demands on Washington's natural resources and diverse environment. The state needs qualified professionals who can address issues relating to soil conservation, air and water pollution, emerging water markets, and use of private market mechanisms, etc.

The market for EREM graduates includes agencies with environmental regulatory responsibilities and resource management/policy agendas; private companies and consulting firms involved with regulatory compliance, economic impact assessments, and planning and policy; and graduate and law schools seeking qualified candidates.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

As reported in the proposal, "*The degree is designed to provide students with the ability to (1) understand economic concepts; (2) integrate and analyze material; (3) communicate in both written and oral formats; and (4) obtain expertise in natural resource management and/or environmental economics and policy.*"

The program of study is 120 credits, including core courses, directed electives, and a capstone experience. It would provide students with a specialization in natural resource management, environmental regulation and policy, or natural resource and environmental pre-law.

The program would be supported primarily by existing resources. At full enrollment it is expected to serve 60 FTE students. Full-time students would be able to complete the program in four years.

ASSESSMENT AND DIVERSITY

An assessment plan has been designed to evaluate how well student learning outcomes have been achieved and how well program objectives have been met. Student learning outcomes would be measured by several methods – portfolios of examinations, papers, and problem sets; case studies; and team real-world problem solving. Program objectives will be measured by several methods as well – alumni and employer satisfaction surveys, internal program reviews, and retention and graduation rates.

To successfully serve a diverse student body, faculty and staff associated with the proposed program would employ a variety of strategies. For example, they would participate in WSU's established diversity recruitment and retention program. They will also solicit multicultural scholars grants to support underrepresented populations who enroll in the program.

REVIEW PARTICIPANTS

In accordance with the HECB Guidelines, staff had other public baccalaureate institutions and two external reviewers review the EREM program. Central and Eastern sent letters indicating their support for the program. The two external reviewers also endorsed the program: Dr. Gregory M. Perry, professor of Agriculture and Resource Economics at Oregon State University; and Dr. John C. Bergstrom, professor of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences at the University of Georgia.

PROGRAM COSTS

The proposed program would be supported through reallocation. Program costs at full enrollment would be about \$575,000, or \$14,480 per FTE student.

STAFF ANALYSIS

WSU's proposed BS in Environmental and Resource Economics and Management would introduce an attractive new program to the state. Strong employer demand and economic growth impacts have been demonstrated. The program would include adequate resources to support a quality teaching and learning experience for faculty and students alike. It would be offered at a reasonable cost through reallocation.

RECOMMENDATION

The Washington State University proposal to establish a Bachelor of Science in Environmental and Resource Economics and Management is recommended for approval, effective July 31, 2002.

RESOLUTION NO. 02-20

WHEREAS, Washington State University has requested approval to establish a Bachelor of Science in Environmental and Resource Economics and Management; and

WHEREAS, The program would address employer needs and state issues relating to economic growth, natural resources, environmental policies, and management; and

WHEREAS, The program of study and resources are adequate to serve students well; and

WHEREAS, The external reviews were supportive of the establishment of the program; and

WHEREAS, The program costs are reasonable;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Washington State University proposal to establish a bachelor of Science in Environmental and Resource Economics and Management, effective July 31, 2002.

Adopted:

July 31, 2002

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Pat Stanford, Secretary

BACHELOR AND MASTER OF SCIENCE IN BIOTECHNOLOGY

Washington State University at Pullman and Spokane

July 2002

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Washington State University proposes to offer Bachelor's and Master's of Science degrees in Biotechnology at Pullman and Spokane. Students who complete either degree program would be well prepared for work in industry, academia, or advanced studies.

As stated in the proposal, "Biotechnology is traditionally defined as the application of modern molecular, computer and engineering techniques to answer basic biological questions and to develop products and practices based on biology for use by society...The impact of biotechnology on the future of every human being and every animal and plant species will define the 21st century..."

PROGRAM NEED

Biotechnology is an attractive career choice for individuals in Washington. The existing and growing number of biotechnology firms in Washington and elsewhere demonstrates need for the proposed BS and MS in biotechnology. Washington has an inadequate number of trained professionals to meet the needs of the Washington biotechnology industry. Here are some facts:

- It is estimated that Washington biotechnology firms will need 2,000 trained workers per year until 2005.
- Projected hiring by biotechnology companies in the greater Spokane region indicates that about 500 new jobs would be created in the next five years.
- The majority of the state's biotechnology companies conduct research and development that require individuals with advanced degrees and specialized scientific skills.

According to *BioPharm Magazine*, "Spokane may be biotech's – and the Pacific Northwest's – best kept secret. The pieces are in place for Spokane to become a biotechnology center in its own right: an active industry association, well-respected educational and research institutions, world-class medical facilities, room to expand, and a wealth of industry knowledge, skills, and experience..."

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The BS and MS degrees in Biotechnology will provide students with:

- Intensive training in laboratory techniques;
- Rigorous academic courses related to the scientific basis of biotechnology;
- A solid background in liberal arts and professional writing; and
- Advanced computer training in bioinformatics and biotechnology.

The BS degree requires 120 credits, including general education courses, core courses, laboratory courses, and certain electives. It is expected that full-time students would complete the BS program in four years. At full enrollment, the program would serve 47 FTE students. Eleven faculty members would support the BS program.

The MS degree requires 30 credits, including laboratory work and biotechnology courses with an applied orientation. It is expected that full-time students would complete the MS program in one year. At full enrollment, the program will serve 23 FTE students. Thirteen faculty members would support the MS program.

DIVERSITY AND ASSESSMENT

The proposed BS and MS biotechnology programs would make every effort to provide access, retention, and the full opportunity to succeed for all students.

Evaluation of students' performance would be ongoing throughout both programs. Faculty would evaluate students' progress via: (1) written and oral examinations, reports, and projects; (2) presentations and experimental analysis conducted during laboratory sessions; and (3) final papers and research projects.

REVIEW PARTICIPANTS

The programs were reviewed externally by Dr. David Koetje, coordinator of the Biotechnology Program at Calvin College; and Dr. Peter B. Goldsbrough, professor of Horticulture and Landscape Architecture at Purdue University. Both external reviewers expressed strong support for the programs. They cited a number of program strengths and weaknesses. WSU responded to the weaknesses cited, clarifying both programs' curricula, requirements, and resources. The proposal also was circulated among the five other public baccalaureate institutions for their review and comment. To date, the staff has received no comments from them.

PROGRAM COSTS

The BS and MS in Biotechnology would be supported through internal reallocation. The cost per FTE student in the undergraduate program at full enrollment would be about \$7,355. The cost per FTE student in the graduate program at full enrollment would be about \$22,590.

STAFF ANALYSIS

WSU would offer unique and challenging biotechnology programs for undergraduate and graduate students. Both programs would be highly attractive to students and local and national biotechnology industries. Program graduates could move directly into the labor force or into advanced studies.

RECOMMENDATION

The Washington State University request to establish a Bachelor and Master of Science in Biotechnology at Pullman and Spokane is recommended for approval, effective July 31, 2002.

RESOLUTION NO. 02-21

WHEREAS, Washington State University is seeking approval to offer a Bachelor and Master of Science at Pullman and Spokane; and

WHEREAS, The programs will be highly attractive to students and employers alike; and

WHEREAS, The external reviews attested to the quality and need for the programs; and

WHEREAS, The programs will prepare individuals for either the job market or advanced studies; and

WHEREAS, The diversity and assessment plans are appropriate for programs of this nature; and

WHEREAS, The program costs are reasonable;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Washington State University proposal to offer a Bachelor and Master of Science in Biotechnology at Pullman and Spokane, effective July 31, 2002.

Adopted:

July 31, 2002

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Pat Stanford, Secretary

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN TECHNICAL COMMUNICATION
University of Washington

July 2002

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The University of Washington proposes to offer a new Doctor of Philosophy in Technical Communication (TC) that will address a growing need in industry and academia. Technical communication emphasizes document and communication design – on making information understandable and available to those who need it.

PROGRAM NEED

The proposal documents the critical need for highly trained technical communication professionals in industry and academia. Here are a few examples:

- According to the Washington Software Alliance, the software industry is struggling with a critical problem: not enough information technology professionals to meet current and planned employment needs. Staffing shortages are particularly critical for software developers, multimedia and Web developers, and technical writers.
- Numerous companies in Washington have large research-and-development groups that are intensively studying how people communicate and how people process information so they can invent new technologies and new strategies to support them.
- The Information Technology Association of America (ITAA) recently reported that the national demand for high-tech workers in 2001 remained strong in spite of the economic downturn. The western region of the nation had the second-largest level of demand for IT workers.
- In 2000, the Association of Teachers of Technical Writing reported there were 120 academic jobs for teachers of technical writing listed through the Modern Language Association.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The PhD in Technical Communication would be a research-based degree requiring completion of 126 credits, including course work and dissertation credits. Doctoral students in the program would be required to complete extensive coursework in theory, research methods, media design and applications, and society and systems. Program graduates would be experts in analyzing communication situations and creating strategies and technologies for solving communication problems.

A full-time student who enters the program with a master's degree will be able to complete the program in three years. At full enrollment the program would serve 22 FTE students and would be supported primarily through existing resources.

ASSESSMENT AND DIVERSITY

The proposal outlines the expected student learning outcomes, the program's goals and objectives, and related assessment methodologies to measure student performance and program vitality. The proposal also asserts that the Department of Technical Communication is committed to achieving diversity in its student population and in the professional field. It has implemented a number of initiatives targeted to recruit and retain students of color and students with disabilities.

REVIEW PARTICIPANTS

The proposal was reviewed extensively by the UW Graduate Proposal Review Committee, which included two external reviewers: Dr. Laura J. Gurak, associate director, Department of Rhetoric at the University of Minnesota; and Dr. David S. Kaufer, professor and head of the Department of English at Carnegie Mellon University. The reviews were very positive, and a few revisions were suggested for the UW's consideration. Eastern Washington University and Western Washington University also shared their support for the proposed program.

PROGRAM COSTS

The program would be supported through internal reallocation that now supports the master's technical communication program, non-state funds from the department's self-sustaining evening program, and externally funded research. Annual program costs would be about \$ 587,953 or \$26,725 per FTE student.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The PhD In Technical Communication would serve local, national and international needs and respond to the increasing demand for highly trained professionals in industry and academia. It is a strong program of high quality that would be supported by a cadre of outstanding faculty. Finally, the assessment and diversity plans are exemplary, and the program costs are reasonable.

RECOMMENDATION

The proposal for a new Doctor of Philosophy in Technical Communication at the University of Washington is recommended for approval, effective July 31, 2002.

RESOLUTION NO. 02-22

WHEREAS, The University of Washington is seeking approval to offer a new Doctor of Philosophy; and

WHEREAS, The University of Washington has the resources and expertise required to offer a high quality program in this discipline; and

WHEREAS, The program will respond to the critical needs of information technology industries and academia locally, nationally, and internationally; and

WHEREAS, The assessment and diversity plans are exemplary; and

WHEREAS, The program costs are reasonable;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the University of Washington request to offer a new Doctor of Philosophy in Technical Communication, effective July 31, 2002.

Adopted:

July 31, 2002

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Pat Stanford, Secretary

STATUS REPORT

Notification of Intent

July 2002

INTRODUCTION

In January 2001, the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) adopted revised *Guidelines for Program Planning, Approval and Review* in order to expedite and improve the process for the institutions and HECB alike. One of the major changes in the *Guidelines* includes a new program review and approval process for existing degree programs proposed to be offered at a branch campus, a new off-campus location, via distance learning technologies, or a combination of delivery methods.

The process requires an institution to submit a Notification of Intent (NOI) in electronic format to the HECB at least 45 days prior to the proposed start date of the program. The NOI includes the following information:

- Name of institution
- Degree title
- Delivery mechanism
- Location
- Implementation date
- Substantive statement of need
- Source of funding
- Year 1 and full enrollment targets (FTE and headcount)

HECB staff posts the institution's NOI on the HECB Web site within five business days of receipt, and via email notifies the provosts of the other public four-year institutions, the Washington Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, the Inter-institutional Committee on Academic Program Planning, and the Council of Presidents. The other public four-year institutions and HECB staff have 30 days to review and comment on the NOI via an email link on the HECB Web site.

If there are no objections, the HECB Executive Director approves the existing degree program proposed to be offered at a branch campus, a new off-campus location, via distance learning technologies, or a combination of delivery methods. If there is controversy, the HECB will employ its dispute resolution process.

STATUS REPORT

From June 11, 2002 through July 11, 2002 the HECB Executive Director has approved the following existing degree program in accordance with the NOI process:

Institution	Degree Title	Location	Approval Date
WSU	BA in Anthropology	Vancouver	July 12, 2002
WSU	MA in History	Vancouver	July 12, 2002
WSU	MS in Environmental Sciences	Vancouver	July 12, 2002
WSU	BA in Humanities	Distance Learning	July 12, 2002



Davey v. Locke: An overview

July 2002

This month, a panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit said the state of Washington and the Higher Education Coordinating Board had violated the First Amendment's religious-freedom provision and the 14th Amendment's equal-protection guarantees when it denied a Washington Promise Scholarship to Joshua Davey, a student who decided to major in both business administration and theology at Northwest College in 1999.

Northwest College is affiliated with the Assemblies of God Church.

The Board rescinded Davey's award, citing state law that prohibits the award of financial aid to students who pursue degrees in theology.

Davey sued the state, and in 2000 a lower federal court ruled in favor of the state.

But the 9th Circuit appeals panel, in a 2-1 decision, said the state's scholarship criteria discriminated "in such a way as to suppress a religious point of view."

The court went on to say the scholarship's broad purpose -- to help pay for the higher education of outstanding students -- requires that it be viewpoint-neutral, rather than exclude only those who study theology.

What's at stake in this ruling is the effect it will have on other financial aid programs.

RCW 28B.10.814 provides that "no aid shall be awarded to any student who is pursuing a degree in theology."

Article I of the state constitution provides "no public money or property shall be appropriated for or applied to any religious worship, exercise or instruction, or the support of any religious establishment..."

The core question here involves the state constitution. A federal court invalidated a provision in the state constitution and in state law that creates the separation of church and state, particularly how it applies to the use of public money.

Staff will continue to work with the assistant attorney general to study the impact of the ruling and to determine options for any further action on the ruling.

2003-05 DRAFT HECB BUDGET REQUEST

July 2002

BACKGROUND

The Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) is a nine-member citizen board, directed in statute “...to represent the broad public interest above the individual interests of the institutions” [RCW 28B.80.320]. The HECB administers all state-funded financial aid so that grants and work study – state and federal – may be coordinated to provide the best possible service to students and ensure the best use of state resources. The Board also provides policy, regulatory, and fiscal recommendations at the request of the Legislature and Governor.

More than one-half of the agency’s 75-FTE workforce is dedicated to administering a statewide program of comprehensive student financial aid. About 14 staff members perform policy development and fiscal analysis for the Legislature and Governor. Other staff provide (1) the Guaranteed Education Tuition (GET) program, a self-sustaining program with no general state support; (2) direct student services (e.g., Displaced Homemaker and GEAR UP programs); (3) “consumer protection” services (e.g., Degree Authorization Act and VA State Approving Agency); and (4) agency support (e.g., personnel and information technology support).

The current spending authority for the HECB (2001-03, state general fund) is \$264 million; 98 percent of that appropriation is earmarked for student aid/ direct services. Presently, the calculated HECB current level of service “carried forward” into the next biennium is about \$271 million. Proposed enhancements for the 2003-05 biennium total \$36 million. Sixty percent of the increase – about \$22 million – is in student aid/direct services enhancements. Not quantified in this request is the amount necessary to cover 2003-05 tuition increases. Of the remaining enhancement, \$10 million is for high-demand enrollments. The requested growth for administrative and operating costs in the agency’s policy and coordination section is one percent.

OFM performs the first review of agency budget requests, and has directed state agencies to submit budget requests by September 6, 2002. Following are the proposed HECB budget “decision packages” for the 2003-05 biennial budget period. These proposals reflect discussion and preliminary decisions of the Board’s Financial Aid Committee, which met by teleconference on June 26 as well as the Board’s Executive Committee, which met on July 1. The Executive Committee adopted a motion to recommend to the full board the following 2003-05 biennial budget requests.

BOARD ACTION REQUESTED

The Board is requested to adopt the following draft 2003-05 budget request. With the adoption by the full Board, these proposals will be refined and drafted to accommodate OFM submittal requirements by September 6.

HECB 2003-05 BUDGET REQUEST**Financial Aid Programs**

Dollars
in Millions

State Need Grant (SNG) **\$11.8**

Requests funds to serve students from families with incomes up to 55 percent of the state's median family income and restore the gap between tuition and the grant for all students to the 2001-02 level. This change would affect about 55,000 students.

Additionally, the Board requests funds to cover tuition increases in 2004 and 2005 on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

State Work Study (SWS) **\$.6**

Increases in college costs and increased wage rates in recent years have eroded the number of students that can be served within current appropriation levels for the State Work Study program. This request would maintain the current level of service per student and maintain service to the same number of students as in 2002-03.

Additionally, the Board requests funds to cover tuition increases in 2004 and 2005 on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

Promise Scholarship **\$6.6**

Requests funding to restore the award amount to 81 percent (2001-02 level) of community college tuition and fees for approximately 6,600 students.

Additionally, the Board requests funds to cover tuition increases in 2004 and 2005 on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

Washington Scholars **\$1.06**

The Board seeks to restore the award to the full value of tuition and fees to 87 percent (2001-02 level) at public institutions for approximately 450 students.

Additionally, the Board requests funds to cover tuition increases in 2004 and 2005 on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

Washington Award for Vocational Excellence (WAVE) \$.9

The Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board administers this program and HECB serves as the fiscal agent. This request is to restore award values to 100 percent of the authorized amount.

Additionally, the Board requests funds to cover tuition increases in 2004 and 2005 on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

Health Professional Loan Repayment and Scholarship Program \$1.0

This request is to enhance total program funding by \$1 million (currently \$2.6 million) to extend offers to an additional 20 applicants in the areas of primary care and oral health in the Loan Repayment program.

WICHE \$.052

This request covers increases in dues and an increase in support fees charged by WICHE for participation in the Professional Student Exchange Program. This request maintains service to the same number of students in the Professional Student Exchange Program (25 students).

Planning and Coordination Programs**High-Demand Enrollments \$10.1**

This request is for \$10.1 million to support a restoration and expansion of the competitive high-demand enrollment grant process that was funded in 1999-01. These competitive grants, which require a match of local funds, are envisioned as a complement to enrollment funding that is included directly in institution budgets. Enrollments funded through this program will be directly responsive to meeting the economic development needs of the state by providing the highly skilled, high-demand graduates that business currently needs. Funds that are awarded to public institutions through this grant program would be included in future base budgets of those institutions so the high demand programs could continue into the future. The Board should consider: (1) proposing to expand eligibility to proposals that create or expand baccalaureate programs in applied and vocational fields, and (2) proposing to expand eligibility for the grants to include partnerships between public institutions and partnerships between public and private institutions (with the public institution as the lead).

Information Technology Grants \$2.0

These competitive matching grants were last funded in the 1999-01 state operating budget for \$2 million. This request asks for the grant program to be reinstated. This program is a complement to the high demand enrollment funding requested above by providing the necessary start-up funding for expensive information technology programs. The state budgeting system generally makes no provision for the start-up costs of implementing or expanding instructional programs, making it very difficult for institutions to initiate them. The funding to be provided through these grants is envisioned as one-time funding, and would likely be used for curriculum development, equipment and software acquisition, and recruitment of the highly-sought-after

faculty and staff necessary to implement or expand information technology programs. Grants would be awarded on a competitive basis and would require a match from institution or private funds.

Improving Student Transfer and Articulation – The Course Applicability System **\$.5**

This proposal is an information technology initiative. The Course Applicability System (CAS) will permit community college students to immediately see how the courses they have taken (or, plan to take) will count toward their major and degree at any of our state's public universities and colleges.

Enhance Financial Aid Delivery System **\$1.225**

The HECB is committed to ensuring student financial aid is delivered fairly, efficiently and according to the legislated intent for each financial aid program we administer. In most cases, the HECB can best serve students by serving those who ultimately deliver funds to students. The higher education institutions that administer aid and businesses that employ students are currently struggling under the combined effects of increasing costs, a sluggish economy, increased demand for their services and, for public institutions and state agency employers, reduced support from the state. By improving the HECB's delivery of student financial aid, the agency can allow these institutions and businesses to gain efficiencies and ultimately better serve students.

These improvements will also allow the HECB to be responsive to requests from legislators, policy makers and other interested parties. By integrating data on all the programs it administers, the HECB will be able to respond more quickly and accurately to these requests. In addition, the HECB will gain efficiencies in performing program reviews, evaluations and developing other reports specifically mandated by statute.

HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD

Requested 2003-05 Operating Budget Level

State General Fund

Dollars in Millions

Financial Aid Programs:	Expenditure Authority 2001-03	Carry Forward Adjustment	Carry Forward Level 2003-05	Proposed Enhancements 2003-05	2003-05 Requested Budget Level	Percent Change Over 2001-03
Policy Enhancements:						
State Need Grant	195.479	8.748	204.227	11.799 *	216.026	
State Work Study	33.700	1.020	34.720	0.600 *	35.320	
Promise Scholarships	14.550	(1.950)	12.600	6.600 *	19.200	
Washington Scholars	2.669	0.187	2.856	1.056 *	3.912	
WA Award for Vocational Excellence	1.177	0.001	1.178	0.896 *	2.074	
Health Professions	2.501	(0.221)	2.280	1.000	3.280	
WICHE	0.474	0.006	0.480	0.052	0.532	
Educational Opportunity Grant	5.840		5.840	-	5.840	
Future Teachers Scholarships	1.000	(1.000)	-	-	-	
Community Scholarship Matching Grants	0.502		0.502	-	0.502	
Child Care Grants	0.150		0.150	-	0.150	
College Assist. Migrant Program Grants	0.050		0.050	-	0.050	
Displaced Homemaker Program	1.063		1.063	-	1.063	
NonProvisoed (Prior biennia COLA, Insurance, Pension)	0.370		0.370		0.370	
COLA, Insurance, Pension - Current Biennium	-	0.109	0.109		0.109	
Subtotal Financial Aid	\$259.525		\$266.425	\$22.003	\$288.428	11.1%
Planning & Coordination:						
Policy Enhancements:						
High-Demand Enrollments	-		-	10.100	10.100	
Information Technology Grants	-		-	2.000	2.000	
Improving Student Transfer/Articulation	-		-	0.500	0.500	
Enhance Financial Aid Delivery System	-		-	1.225	1.225	
Administration & Operating Costs	3.983	(0.120)	3.863	-	3.863	
COLA, Insurance, Pension - Current Biennium		0.162	0.162	-	0.162	
Subtotal Administration & Operating Costs	3.983	0.042	4.025	-	4.025	1.1%
Teacher Training Pilot	0.300		0.300	-	0.300	
Jefferson County Demonstration Project	0.350		0.350	-	0.350	
Subtotal Planning & Coordination	\$4.633		\$4.675	\$13.825	\$18.500	299.3%
Totals	\$264.158		\$271.100	\$35.828	\$306.928	16.2%

Note: * Also requesting dollar for dollar coverage of 2003-05 tuition increases.

Preliminary Outlook 2003-05 Biennium

June 2002

2001-03 Biennium

- Operating Budget Appropriations \$22.451 Billion
- Revenues Available \$22.849 Billion
(Including all reserves and “additional resources”)
- Remaining Reserves \$398 Million
(Including General Fund and Emergency Reserve Fund)

There will continue to be a revenue problem in the 2003-05 Biennium.

2003-05 Biennium

- Potential GF-S Spending \$24.225 Billion
- GF-S Revenues and Reserves \$23.363 Billion
- Potential Deficit (\$862 Million)

Sources: Office of the Forecast Council, June 2002; Office of Financial Management, April 2, 2002.

HECB, June 24, 2002

RESOLUTION NO. 02-23

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) is a nine-member citizen board, directed in statute “...*to represent the broad public interest above the individual interests of the institutions*” [RCW 28B.80.320]; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board administers all state-funded financial aid so that loans, grants, and work – state and federal – may be coordinated to provide the best possible service to students and make best use of state resources; and

WHEREAS, The Board also provides policy, regulatory, and fiscal recommendations at the request of the Legislature and Governor; and

WHEREAS, The Board is mindful of the fiscal constraints of the next biennium and must set forth critical needs of the programs it administers to the Governor and the Legislature; and

WHEREAS, The budget request reflects the comments and decisions of the Board’s Financial Aid and Executive Committees; and

WHEREAS, The Office of Financial Management (OFM) has directed public agencies to submit budget requests for the 2003-05 biennium by September 6, 2002;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approved the biennial budget request presented to the Board on July 31, 2002, and directs staff to refine and redraft the request to accommodate OFM submittal requirements by September 6, 2002.

Adopted:

July 31, 2002

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Pat Stanford, Secretary

DRAFT
SCOPE OF THE 2004 MASTER PLAN

July 2002

Background

Preliminary work has begun on the Higher Education Coordinating Board's 2004 Master Plan for Higher Education. When the Board discussed the strategic plan at its meeting on June 11, the members indicated their intention to focus on a limited number of issues that are critical to the short-term and long-term future of higher education in Washington. They also said the document should review the recent history and current status of higher education, and articulate core policies that should guide the state's strategies.

The purpose of the master plan discussion at the July 31 meeting at Western Washington University is to consider this draft "scope" statement for the master plan, which will outline the framework of the plan and identify the key issues to be considered. The scope statement will focus the plan and guide the activities of Board members and staff in the coming months. The July 31 meeting will include comments from interested parties, including representatives of the state's public and private colleges and universities. The Board will consider revisions to the draft plan and is scheduled to formally adopt the scope statement at its meeting on Sept. 25.

Purpose and themes of the master plan

Washington has an excellent higher education system, but that system faces serious threats. The erosion in recent years of funding support and key policy elements will, if not addressed, undermine efforts to ensure that all citizens have access to an affordable, high-quality college education.

For example, operating costs have risen considerably, but colleges and universities receive less inflation-adjusted funding per student from the state than they did 10 years ago. Meanwhile, students are being forced to pay sharply higher tuition – a burden that hits hardest for low- and middle-income students. Funding to expand enrollment and for costly new high-technology programs is not keeping pace with student and employer needs.

In an environment of restricted funding and uncertain policies, the dedication and commitment of individual state policy-makers, college administrators, faculty and staff – and the tenacity and hard work of the students themselves – have been critical to the state's ability to maintain the opportunity for students to receive a high-quality college education. If not addressed quickly, current trends will deny future students the opportunities that Washington residents historically have taken for granted.

A number of specific higher education challenges will be addressed in the 2004 master plan:

- **Budget constraints** have forced the state to restrict the base funding that forms the foundation for all programs and services at the public colleges and universities. Critical decisions about funding, enrollment and tuition policy are made on the basis of the state's immediate budget needs and revenue realities.
- Washington has had no statutory **tuition policy** for most of the past decade and has forced students to pay an increasing share of their educational cost without a policy-based rationale for doing so.
- Authorization of new **enrollments** – and the funding to support them – is not keeping pace with the growth in population and citizens' needs for college-level education and job training.
- The state's response to the need for new and expanded **"high-demand" programs** in such fields as health care and information technology falls far short of the level needed by Washington employers.
- **Capital funding** decisions are made in response to anecdotal perceptions about the institutions' and sectors' needs, but without clear long-term directions and policies; and
- The state's uncertain and unclear budget and policy environment undermines efforts to develop **shared priorities** among higher education constituents, who frequently see the decision-making process as a zero-sum game where one group's gain is another's loss.

The HECB master plan offers an opportunity to discuss these critical issues – and to recommend new and different actions to address them – *before* the state drifts farther down a path that, in the Board's view, will compromise higher education quality, restrict opportunities for students, and jeopardize the state's competitive position in the national and world economy.

The value and purpose of higher education

The master plan will include a concise statement of the purpose and value of higher education. The plan will examine the critical role of public and private colleges and universities in supporting a democratic society, individual initiative, and a strong state economy.

The current status of higher education in Washington

The plan will review the core policies that underlie the state's higher education system and will describe the "state of the state" of higher education in relation to those policies. The plan will use key indicators to assess the health of the state system. Indicators will address issues such as faculty salaries, tuition and financial aid, and branch campus activities. The plan will assess progress toward the goals identified in the last master plan in light of changes in the higher education operating environment since the plan was published in January 2000.

Examination of core higher education policies

The assessment of the current condition of higher education will lead to a re-examination of the effectiveness of existing policies and funding practices and recommendations for change. The plan will address a number of critical issues that face state policy-makers in the next several years, as described below.

Higher education financing:

The HECB believes the state cannot maintain educational opportunity and quality in an environment where budgets are restricted while colleges and universities are required to continually serve more students and provide an ever-increasing array of services.

Key questions: Should the state change the present method of financing its higher education system? Should the state use a dedicated funding source for higher education, or would dedicated funding simply be offset by reductions in the state's discretionary spending? What new revenue alternatives are available? Which revenue options appear to have the soundest policy basis in relation to the missions of the individual institutions and the system as a whole? Should the state consider policies to move toward "privatizing" the public research universities by granting them more operating autonomy?

Enrollment opportunities:

New enrollments to keep pace with population. The Office of Financial Management estimates that the state will need to fund about 30,000 additional full-time enrollments (FTEs) by 2010 in the public colleges and universities simply to maintain the current level of service to Washington citizens. These new enrollments will be needed *in addition to* the enrollment expansion that is already expected at private colleges and universities.

Key questions: How should the state respond to this general enrollment pressure? Could the state expand opportunities for students by converting the branch campuses to independent four-year universities? Should some community colleges be permitted to evolve into baccalaureate degree-granting schools? What are the capital construction implications of enrollment increases, especially at campuses that have reached their physical capacity and at schools with significant needs to preserve current capital assets?

High-demand enrollments. The need for specialized educational programs – often described as "high-demand" programs – is growing rapidly. The state has a mixed record in providing these programs. Currently, there are not enough skilled graduates to meet the state's need for more health care workers, computer engineers, and many other occupations. High-demand programs such as computer engineering and medical training are often some of the most expensive offerings at a college or university.

Key questions: How can the state respond more effectively to the need for new and expanded high-demand programs? Can the state enhance the economic impact of the college and university system without sacrificing “traditional” programs that have proven their worth in supporting an educated population of responsible, civic-minded citizens? How can the state resist over-reacting to economic upswings and downturns that often occur more quickly than the colleges and universities can create new programs or retool older ones? Should state funding recognize differences in educational program costs (i.e., upper division v. lower division, high-tech v. traditional classroom instruction)?

Tuition and financial aid:

From 1977 to 1995, the state set tuition on the basis that students should pay a specified share of the cost of their education. State funding to the colleges and universities provided the remainder. Since the state abandoned the linkage of tuition to the cost of instruction, there has been no clear tuition-setting policy. As a result, decisions about tuition have been made on the basis of the state’s financial needs of the moment. This situation leads to large spikes in tuition, puts significant stress on the financial aid system, and requires lawmakers to provide substantial funding increases for student aid during times when available funds are reduced.

Key questions: Should the state have a long-term tuition policy set in statute? Should the state change the current tuition-setting system to strengthen the linkage between tuition levels and overall higher education funding? What is the “fair share” of the costs that students and their families should bear?? And how much should taxpayers contribute? Should the state consider a “high-tuition, high-financial aid” approach? If students are expected to pay significantly higher prices to attend college, what is the state’s financial obligation to provide a better “product” for students? Can the state afford to maintain its current commitment to student financial aid? Can it afford not to?

Branch campus issues:

The Washington State Institute for Public Policy is conducting a study of the role, mission and operation of the research university branch campuses. Also, Washington State University is conducting an internal planning process to guide the future of its branches in Spokane, the Tri-Cities and Vancouver. The HECB master plan initially will rely on the information and analysis related to these activities.

Key questions: Are the branch campuses fulfilling their original mission? Should the mission of the branches be changed to allow for lower-division courses? What is the quality of the relationships between the branch campuses and local community and technical colleges? Would new or different policies increase the number of transfer students who receive their degrees through the branch campuses?

Degree production:

Transfer of credit. Each year, about 12,500 community and technical college students transfer to four-year colleges and universities to continue their bachelor degree studies. There is widespread agreement that the “transfer and articulation” system must work more efficiently and effectively for students if the state is to realize its goal of increasing the number of highly trained and educated baccalaureate-level college graduates.

Key questions: How can the state better coordinate transfer-related information to make sure students know what they need to make good choices about courses and programs during their first two years of college? How can the colleges and universities improve the advising process in the current tight-funding environment? How should the state assign institutional responsibility for the development of applied technical degrees?

Alignment of high school graduation and college admission requirements. A student who graduates from high school is not necessarily prepared for college, as shown by high enrollment rates in remedial classes at college and high college drop-out rates. To succeed in college, students must be well prepared in high school. In Washington, the K-12 and higher education systems historically have operated independently, so the state needs coordinated efforts to improve students’ opportunities to achieve their college goals.

Key questions: How should a college preparatory curriculum be defined? Should all students in high school be prepared for college? How should the Certificate of Mastery be used, if at all, in the college admissions process? Should students be required to achieve the Certificate of Mastery to participate in Running Start or to receive the Promise Scholarship? Should students enroll in college as soon as they earn the certificate?

Recommendations and goals for implementation

Based on the elements outlined above, the master plan will include recommendations for changes in the state’s core policies and funding practices for higher education. The plan will include proposals for statewide goals, a discussion of responsibilities and options for measuring performance.

Eastern Washington University's Gender Equity Plan for Athletics

July 2002

Background

RCW 28B.15.460 authorizes the use of tuition and fee waivers to “achieve gender equity in intercollegiate athletics.” The four-year institutions are authorized to waive up to one percent of gross operating fee revenue to achieve equity goals in athletic programs. The Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) and the institutions agree that the waivers have been effective tools for expanding athletic opportunities for women.

The waiver policy went into effect in 1991-92. Since that time, the Legislature has required institutions that would like to continue using waivers to meet progressively more challenging equity goals:

- The use of waivers in 1992-93 was made contingent upon Higher Education Coordinating Board approval of institutions’ plans to achieve gender equity.
- By 1998, institutions were required to have female athletic participation equal to the 42 percent rate seen in high school athletics in Washington. All institutions met this standard.
- By June 2002, institutions had to achieve a rate of female athletic participation within five percentage points of the representation of female students between the ages of 17 and 24 enrolled full-time on the main campus. For example, if an institution had a female enrollment of 55 percent, 50 percent of its athletes had to be women. Institutions failing to meet the standard would have to submit a new gender equity plan for approval by the HECB.

Performance: Five of six institutions met the 2002 tuition waiver goal

The table below summarizes institutional performance regarding the June 2002 requirement. Only Eastern Washington University failed to meet the five percent standard. Eastern has submitted a new gender equity plan for the Board’s approval.

	Number of women athletes	Percent of athletes who are women	Percent of full-time undergrads (17-24) who are women	Gap between female enrollment, athletic participation	Meets June 2002 goal?
CWU	251	53.5	53.0	(0.5)	yes
EWU	186	41.0	57.0	16.0	no
TESC	57	55.9	57.1	1.2	yes
UW	324	47.7	51.3	3.6	yes
WSU	248	46.2	50.4	4.2	yes
WWU	184	51.5	56.4	4.9	yes

Eastern Washington University's Gender Equity Plan for Athletics

Eastern's plan would bring it into compliance with the five percent requirement. If the Board approves the plan, the University will be able to continue issuing gender equity waivers to athletes in 2003-04 and beyond.

The plan has three elements: *roster management* (expanding the rosters of women's teams, reducing the rosters of men's teams), *program elimination* (reducing the number of male athletes by eliminating an athletic program), and the *addition of a women's sport or sports*.

1. Roster management

Beginning in the 2002-03 academic year, Eastern will strive to meet the five percent goal through "roster management," expanding the rosters of existing women's teams and capping the squad sizes of men's teams. *The changes Eastern proposes would increase the number of female athletes from 186 to 235 (by 49 participants) and decrease the number of male athletes from 255 to 205 (50 participants).* Squad sizes will fluctuate a bit, but Eastern plans the following changes in athletic participation:

Increasing roster sizes on women's teams

	2001-02 participation	2003-04 participation needed to reach 5% goal	Change
Outdoor track and field	45	65	+20
Indoor track and field	45	50	+ 5
Golf	9	12	+ 3
Basketball	12	16	+ 4
Volleyball	15	16	+ 1
Soccer	37	43	+ 6
Tennis	11	15	+ 4
Cross country	12	18	+ 6
Totals	186	235	+49

Cutting roster sizes on men's teams

	2001-02 participation	2003-04 participation needed to reach 5% goal	Change
Outdoor track and field	55	42	-13
Indoor track and field	55	42	-13
Basketball	14	14	0
Football	93	85	- 8
Tennis	11	10	- 1
Golf	8	0	- 8
Cross country	19	12	- 7
Totals	255	205	-50

2. Program elimination

Eastern's plan would reduce the roster of the men's golf team to zero, eliminating the program. This action would leave the University with six men's athletic programs.

3. Adding a women's sport or sports

For two years, Eastern has been studying the possibility of adding a new women's sport or increasing women's opportunities for participation with a development track and field program.¹ The institution investigated the feasibility of adding skiing, swimming, softball, and development track and field. It considered expenses, facilities, coaching needs, squad sizes, the availability of athletes, the proximity of potential competitors, the potential for league affiliation, NCAA requirements, and other factors. Eastern concluded that development track and field and skiing were the most feasible new programs, and plans to move forward with a development track and field program in 2002-03 and, it hopes, a ski team in 2003-04.

Assessment

Eastern's administration has approved the plan. If put into effect, the plan – through roster management – would achieve the five percent standard set by the Legislature. If Board approval rests simply on whether the Eastern plan would or would not achieve the five percent standard, the plan should be approved because the institution will reach the statutory goal if it follows through on its plan. Yet some may be alarmed at the prospect of cutting 50 existing opportunities for male athletes as part of the plan for achieving the waiver statute's equity goal.

Alternatives

It appears that Eastern has few alternatives to the approaches sketched in its plan. To achieve the 52 percent standard without eliminating any roster spots on men's teams in 2001-02, the University would have needed approximately 87 more female athletes. If its existing women's teams and development track and field absorbed 49 athletes (as its equity plan suggests is possible), it would have to have added 38 more women's roster slots. Adding two more sports from the list of the most feasible options Eastern considered – swimming and softball – would have generated the 38 roster spots, with a projected cost of roughly \$250,000. This action would have yielded 51.7 percent female athletes at Eastern, just barely bringing the school into compliance with the five percent standard.

¹ In development programs, athletes who need to improve their skills to compete at the Division I scholarship level compete against community colleges, NAIA, and Division II and III opponents. These are non-scholarship athletes.

RESOLUTION NO. 02-24

WHEREAS, State law requires that the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) report every four years, beginning December 1998, on institutional efforts to comply with state requirements for gender equity in intercollegiate athletic programs; and

WHEREAS, State law authorizes the use of tuition and fee waivers to achieve gender equity in intercollegiate athletics; and

WHEREAS, Tuition and fee waivers are recognized as an effective tool for expanding athletic opportunities for women; and

WHEREAS, By June 2002, all institutions were to achieve a rate of female athletic participation within five percentage points of the representation of female students between the ages of 17 and 24 enrolled full-time on the main campus; and

WHEREAS, Any institution that was not within the five percent requirement is to have a new plan achieving gender equity in intercollegiate athletic programs approved by the Higher Education Coordinating Board before granting further waivers after the 2002-03 academic year; and

WHEREAS, Five of the six public baccalaureate institutions in this state met the 2002 tuition waiver goal; and

WHEREAS, Eastern Washington University failed to meet the five percent standard and has submitted a new gender equity plan for the Board's approval; and

WHEREAS, Eastern's new plan will bring it into compliance with the five percent requirement and the University would be allowed to continue issuing gender equity waivers to athletes in 2003-04 and beyond;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves Eastern Washington University's 2002 gender equity plan for athletics.

Adopted:

July 31, 2002

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Pat Stanford, Secretary

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT PROGRAM Update

July 2002

BACKGROUND

The 1987 Master Plan adopted by the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) cited inadequate access to baccalaureate education for the state's urban population as an urgent problem. At the recommendation of the HECB, the 1990 Legislature established the Educational Opportunity Grant (EOG) program as one of three strategies designed to address the need for greater access to baccalaureate education. The other strategies included lifting enrollment lids at four-year public institutions, and creating branch campuses to serve upper-division and graduate students living in the state's urban areas.

The EOG program was created as a demonstration project to provide another educational option for "placebound"¹ residents living in counties that branch campuses serve. It was based on an assumption that the size and, therefore, the construction and operating costs of the proposed branch campuses could be reduced if students could be encouraged, through the provision of a \$2,500 grant, to enroll in existing public or independent institutions with capacity.

Like other financial aid programs, the EOG program requires recipients to demonstrate financial need. The program is unique, however, in several ways. Currently, to receive an EOG, a student must:

- Have received an associate of arts degree or its equivalent;
- Intend to complete a baccalaureate degree;
- Meet the statutory definition of "placebound;"
- Reside in one of 13 counties served by a branch campus;
- Attend a Washington public or private four-year college or university with the capacity to accommodate students within existing education programs and facilities; and
- Adhere to the EOG program's religious-program exclusion.²

Finally, as noted above, because the program was established to encourage needy, placebound students to attend existing baccalaureate institutions, the enabling legislation also stipulates that recipients may not use the grant to attend a branch campus.

¹ RCW 28B.101.020(1) defines placebound as, "unable to relocate to complete a college program because of family or employment commitments, health concerns, monetary inability, or other similar factors." Subpart (2) of the same section states, "...A placebound resident is one who may be influenced by the receipt of an enhanced student financial aid award to attend an institution that has existing unused capacity rather than attend a branch campus established pursuant to chapter 28B.45 RCW. An eligible placebound applicant is further defined as a person whose residence is located in an area served by a branch campus who, because of family or employment commitments, health concerns, monetary need, or other similar factors, would be unable to complete an upper-division course of study but for receipt of an educational opportunity grant."

² RCW 28B.101.040, "...The participant shall not be eligible for a grant if it will be used for any programs that include religious worship, exercise, or instruction or to pursue a degree in theology..."

A supplement to other grant aid, the EOG reduces the amount of need-based loans the student would otherwise have to assume or helps cover documented need not met by other aid programs. Its purpose is to provide a financial incentive to enable placebound students who face barriers to continuing their education to enroll in local colleges or universities or to relocate to complete their baccalaureate degrees.

In the 1997, 1998, and 1999 legislative sessions interest was shown in modifying various aspects of the EOG program. Bills were introduced over that period of time that would have (1) extended eligibility to students from all counties; (2) permitted students to use the grants at branch campuses; (3) eliminated reference to unused capacity; and (4) used the grant to fill unused enrollments. Another bill, introduced in 1998, would have authorized the use of Educational Opportunity Grants at WSU's Vancouver branch campus, and for Oregon border county reciprocity. In 1999, some legislators expressed interest in expanding eligibility to students in all counties, but deferred action until the Board had had an opportunity to complete its review of the program and recommend any modifications.

In the summer and fall of 2000, the Board conducted a thorough review of the program to evaluate the program's effectiveness in achieving the goals of the enabling legislation, and also to consider whether statutory or regulatory modification should be proposed because of changes in higher education delivery since 1990. As a result of that study, the Board adopted Resolution 00-55 at its December 6, 2000, meeting. The resolution recommends the following program changes.

1. **County of Residence.** Eligibility should be expanded to residents of all counties.
2. **Branch Campuses.** Eligibility should be extended to students who wish to enroll at state-supported branch campuses, enabling recipients to select the program and eligible institution that best responds to their educational goals.
3. **Institutional Participation.** Institutional eligibility should be extended to branch campuses, extension sites, and educational facilities that operate within Washington, that are affiliated with regionally accredited nonprofit institutions in another state, and meet the following criteria:
 - Have delivered on-site classroom instruction within Washington for a minimum specified period of time;
 - Are fully certified and participate in federal student financial aid programs;
 - Are eligible for and participate in the Washington State Need Grant program; and,
 - Provide necessary assurances of administrative capability.
4. **Grant Amounts.** Grant amounts should be established by rule of the Board, rather than in statute, so that they may be periodically adjusted, as necessary, to reflect such factors as changes in the costs of attendance and the availability of other grant assistance.

5. **Period of Award.** Administrative procedures should be changed to permit grant periods to begin during any academic term upon the student's transfer to an eligible institution, with continuing eligibility contingent upon attainment of junior status by the end of the first term of award, with a maximum award period of eight quarters (or equivalent).
6. **Transfer Degrees.** The enabling legislation should be changed to include reference to the Associate of Science degree, and any other two-year degree approved by the Board, as an appropriate transfer degree for purposes of establishing eligibility for the EOG.
7. **"Unused Institutional Capacity."** The concept of "unused institutional capacity" is no longer relevant, and its reference should be eliminated.
8. **Program Status.** Reference to the EOG program as a demonstration project should be deleted, and the program should be continued as an on-going program that complements the state's other financial aid programs.

Concurrent with the study, adoption of the evaluation report and passage of the resolution, the program was involved in litigation testing the constitutionality of the program. On June 13, 2002, the Washington Supreme Court ruled in a six-three decision that the program upholds the constitution of the state of Washington.

Given that outcome, if the Board so directs, staff will begin the steps necessary to seek statutory amendments incorporating the recommendations of Board Resolution 00-55.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT PROGRAM

Update on Washington Supreme Court Ruling

July 2002

The Washington Supreme Court on June 13 upheld the state's Educational Opportunity Grant (EOG) program. The EOG program was created in 1990 as one of several strategies to increase access to upper-division enrollment. The program provides \$2,500 renewable grants, to students who have completed the first two years of higher education, as an incentive to go on and complete their baccalaureate degrees.

The case stemmed from a 1995 lawsuit filed by the American Civil Liberties Union on behalf of Mary Gallwey, a professor at Washington State University. Gallwey contended the program, which provides financial aid grants to needy students in certain counties in Washington, violated the state and federal constitutions. The case challenged the use of the program funds at Washington's religiously affiliated colleges and universities.

In 1996, the case was referred to Thurston County Superior Court for findings of fact, conclusions of law and a decision. In May 1999, Judge Daniel Berschauer ruled against the program and immediately referred the case back to the Supreme Court. In his decision Berschauer wrote that he expected the Supreme Court to overturn his ruling and therefore allowed the program to continue pending appeal.

In its defense, the state said the purposes of the program were entirely secular. The program stipulates that students be the recipients of the funds, and that those accepting the grant funds cannot be involved in programs that include religious worship, exercise or instruction, or pursue a degree in religious, seminarian or theological academic studies.

The Supreme Court determined that the program satisfied constitutional provisions that apply to higher education institutions. In its conclusion, the court said the EOG Program was designed to meet the critical needs of "placebound" financially needy students, not to foster religion or religious worship.

By way of background, the Legislature had enacted the grant program in 1990, based on findings that:

- Washington's participation rate for upper-division course work ranked 46th in the nation;
- The state's largest population growth was occurring in areas surrounding Seattle that were not served by a public university; and
- There was a significant disparity in access to upper-division course work based on geography.

Currently, the program serves about 1,000 students in the six public baccalaureate colleges and universities in the state, as well as eleven private institutions. The state Legislature earmarked \$2.9 million to help students in the 2002-03 academic year.

PATHWAYS TO CAREERS IN TEACHING PHASE II

Executive Summary Year one 2001-2002

July 2002

Pathways Background and Purpose

Western Washington University, in collaboration with Everett Community College, Skagit Valley College, and Whatcom Community College and regional school districts, established the *Pathways to Careers in Teaching* program through a grant awarded by the Higher Education Coordinating Board in October 1999. The Pathways program has these primary purposes:

1. To support an efficient, non-redundant articulation stream from public schools, to community college direct transfer A.A. degree programs, to Bachelor's degree with teacher certification programs at Western; and
2. To increase the proportion of students of color in teacher education programs.

During Phase I, consortium institutions made substantial progress toward articulating course equivalencies for teacher candidates, in Early Childhood Education. New links between high school teacher academies, community colleges, and WWU were established that will continue through ongoing transfer and tracking mechanisms begun during this project.

Pathways Phase II, is a *new* collaborative teacher training project that targets the critical need for well qualified teachers of mathematics, science and special education and broadens related objectives conceptualized or initiated during Phase I. Pathways Phase II will also strengthen the Phase I Articulation Agreement, wherein consortium members pledge to continue to develop policies, programs, curricula and initiatives that speak to the recruitment, retention, and efficient graduation of regional students interested in pursuing degree programs in the areas of education.

Objective One - *Implement the articulation of courses and programs to facilitate the efficient completion of teacher education programs in subject matter shortage areas, effectively reducing the time to degree at the baccalaureate level.* This objective targets the subject matter shortage areas of math, science and special education. Year one accomplishments include the creation of a Science Ed articulation grid for partner institutions, and a model program (Green River CC), and an outreach program (Seattle Central CC). Also, consortia math faculty cooperatively developed a new algebra for teachers course as a pre-requisite for required math methods courses in Elementary and Special Education.

Objective Two - *Create stronger and more effective means of distributing information about teacher training programs and the availability of community college course equivalencies and direct transfer degrees, to a diverse group of prospective students.* In year one, a poster and bookmarks were created for recruiting students into the high school WSTRFT Teaching Academy programs in the consortia areas and into the Teacher Education program at WWU. Consortia members worked on advising issues and at least one created new advising sheets based on the resulting information. Project Teach coordinators from Green River CC made a presentation on their articulated program with Central Washington University.

Objective Three – *Integrate K-12 system Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs) into general college requirement courses as a foundation for future teacher certification candidates.* The newly created algebra for teachers course (Math 102T) was developed to include the integration of the K-12 EALRs. The process of including EALR content in this course is a model for alignment of general university requirements in other academic subject areas.